PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To:	ı				PCT	
see form PCT/ISA/220				WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT (PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)		
				Date of mailing (day/month/year)	see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220				FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
	national application		International filing date (d 12.01.2004	lay/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 13.01.2003	
RAI	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention			egard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial		
1	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state	inion nent of opinion with rega f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i>	ard to novelty, inver	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
l	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. V	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; cir Certain docum	inion nent of opinion with regal f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> tations and explanations ents cited	ard to novelty, inver 1(a)(i) with regard supporting such st	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; ci- Certain docum Certain defects	inion nent of opinion with rega f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> tations and explanations	ard to novelty, inver 1(a)(i) with regard supporting such st	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
	Box No. I Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VII	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; cir Certain docum Certain defects Certain observ	nent of opinion with regal f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> tations and explanations ents cited s in the international app	ard to novelty, inver 1(a)(i) with regard supporting such st	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
2.	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. V Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; cit Certain docum Certain defects Certain observations international prelifithe International coses an Authoriteau under Rule	nent of opinion with regal finvention ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> tations and explanations ents cited in the international appations on the internation is not preliminary examination is not preliminary examining ity other than this one to	ard to novelty, inver 1(a)(i) with regard supporting such standard lication al application ade, this opinion was Authority (*IPEA*) be the IPEA and the	to novelty, inventive step or industrial	
	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. VV Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; circertain docum Certain defects Certain observ ION International prelifithe International Int	nent of opinion with regal invention ement under Rule 43bis tations and explanations ents cited in the international appations on the internation iminary examination is neal Preliminary Examining ty other than this one to 66.1bis(b) that written over considered to be a very together, where appropri	ard to novelty, inverting and to novelty, inverting and apporting such a lication al application ande, this opinion volume the IPEA and the pinions of this Intervritten opinion of the prinate, with amendricate, with a mendricate, with a	to novelty, inventive step or industrial tatement vill usually be considered to be a . However, this does not apply where the chosen IPEA has notifed the	
	Box No. II Box No. III Box No. IV Box No. VV Box No. VI Box No. VIII Box No. VIII FURTHER ACTI	Basis of the op Priority Non-establishm Lack of unity of Reasoned state applicability; circentain docum Certain defects Certain observ ION International prelifications an Authoriteau under Rule insidered. as provided about a written replification of the internation of the inter	nent of opinion with regard invention ement under Rule 43bis tations and explanations ents cited in the international appations on the internation is neal Preliminary Examining the other than this one to 66.1bis(b) that written one over, considered to be a very together, where approp	ard to novelty, inverting and to novelty, inverting and apporting such a lication al application ande, this opinion volume the IPEA and the pinions of this Intervritten opinion of the prinate, with amendricate, with a mendricate, with a	vill usually be considered to be a . However, this does not apply where ne chosen IPEA has notifed the national Searching Authority e IPEA, the applicant is invited to nents, before the expiration of three	

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465 Authorized Officer

Merckling-Ruiz, V

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8590



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/000134

_	Во	x N	o. I Basis of the opinion
			egard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in guage in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		lai	his opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search nder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	Wi ne	th re	egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and eary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. 1	type	of material:
		Ø	a sequence listing
			table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b . 1	form	at of material:
	٠	\boxtimes	in written format
		\boxtimes	in computer readable form
	c. t	ime	of filling/furnishing:
			contained in the international application as filed.
			filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		Ø	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
3.		ha co	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto is been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional pies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as propriate, were furnished.
4.	Ad	ditio	nal comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/000134

•	ox No. II	Priority					
I. 🛭	The fol	lowing document ha	s not bee	en furnished	d:		
	⋈	copy of the earlier a	applicatio	n whose pr	iority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).		
		translation of the ea	arlier app	lication who	ose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).		
	Consecute neverth	quently it has not be neless been establis	en possib hed on th	ole to consi ne assumpt	der the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has ion that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.		
2. 🛘	has be	opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.					
Во	ox No. V		nent und		bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or no supporting such statement		
. Sta	atement	-					
	- 14 (8.15			_			
No	velty (N)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-11,13-17 12		
	venty (N) ventive st	ep (IS)			•		

see separate sheet

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:
 - D1: WO 01/34181 A (RAO ERCOLE; RAPPOLD HOERBRAND GUDRUN (DE))
 17 May 2001 (2001-05-17)
 - D2: EP-A-1 260 228 (RAPPOLD HOERBRAND GUDRUN) 27 November 2002 (2002-11-27)
 - D3: RAO E. ET AL.: "The Leri-Weill syndrome homeobox gene SHOX encodes a cell-type specific transcriptional activator." HUMAN MOLECULAR GENETICS, vol. 10, no. 26, 2001, pages 3083-3091, XP002293247
 - D4: WO 02/074234 A (PROCHON BIOTECH LTD; YAYON AVNER (IL); GOLEMBO MYRIAM (IL)) 26 September 2002 (2002-09-26)
 - D5: DATABASE MEDLINE US NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE (NLM), BETHESDA, MD, US; Abstract No. NLM1070532 2002, BETTENCOURT P.: "Bain natriuretic peptide (nesiritide) in the treatment of heart failure." XP002293248

Unless specified otherwise, the relevant passages are the ones that are cited in the Search Report.

Regarding point V

- The use of natriuretic peptides ANP or BNP, alone or in combination with other active agents, for the manufacture of a medicament for treating short stature in patients suspected of having a defect in the SHOX gene has not been previously disclosed. Claims 1-11 and 17 are novel.
- 2.1 Claim 12 is directed to a composition comprising ANP or BNP, the other technical features being non-limiting for the scope of the claim. Such a composition is anticipated in D5.
- 2.3 There is no prior disclosure of a composition comprising ANP or BNP in combination with growth hormone or SHOX peptide. Claims 13-16 are novel.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/000134

- 3. The technical problem solved by the application is to provide a therapeutic agent for treating short stature related to a defect in the SHOX gene.
 - In D2, the same technical problem is solved by administering a SHOX peptide, alone or in combination with growth hormone, to patients having a defect in the SHOX gene. The relationship between expression of SHOX and ANP or BNP is not mentioned.

In D4, the natriuretic peptide CNP is used for stimulating bone elongation in patients with abnormal bone growth. ANP and BNP are mentioned (page 10 lines 18-22) but the whole application is directed to the use of CNP only. D4 is not an enabling disclosure for the use of ANP or BNP as therapeutic agents.

It follows that the subject matter of claims 1-11 and 13-17 is inventive over the prior art.